



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,808	08/02/2001	Hiroyuki Inaba	Q65683	4296

7590 05/20/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,  
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
----------

BELL, PAUL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/919,808

**Applicant(s)**

INABA ET AL.

**Examiner**

PAUL A BELL

**Art Unit**

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakadozono (5,121,112) in view of Watabe et al. (5,796,936).

With regard to claim 1 Nakadozone teaches a display control device (figure 2) comprising: an input signal processing section for processing an input signal (figure 2, item 12), a display section for displaying an image (figure 2, item 50), a first display control section for processing an output signal from the input signal processing section and outputting a first display signal to be displayed on the display section (figure 2, item 11),

Nakadozono does not teach, "a second display control section operated by an operating system program, the second display control section for processing the first display signal from the first display control section and outputting a second display signal to be displayed on the display section and a signal switching section for outputting the second display signal from the second display control section on to the display section at the normal time, the signal switching section for outputting the first display signal from the first display control section onto the display section when an abnormal condition of the second display control section is detected ."

However Watabe et al., like applicant teaches a vehicle control system, which illustrates the concept of using a plurality of controllers and a detect means for detecting a fault, overload or runaway condition in controller and then switching the load or task of the faulty controller to another controller to perform the backup(SEE Watabe et al. column 1, lines 10-20, 50-67, column 2, lines 1-11, column 4, lines 10-20, column 22, lines 11-35, column 24, lines 26-36 figures 1, 17, and 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Nakadozono first display control system to have a plurality of "controllers" to include at least a first display control section (first controller) and a second display control section (second controller) as taught by Watabe et al. because Watabe et al. gives numerous motivational statements in column 22, lines 11-35 for improving a apparatus like Nakadozono by using multiple controllers.

With regard to claim 12 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. was shown above in claim 1 to read on most of the limitations of claim 12 and in addition, "wherein the first and second display signals comprise image data regarding the vehicle condition (SEE Nakadozono column 1, lines 6-10), and the image data of the display signal from the first display control section has a lower resolution than the image data of the display signal from the second display control section (SEE Nakadozono abstract to summarize teaches the concept of high and low resolution because when the signal is high priority it is displayed on both segments (this reads on high resolution) and when the signal is low priority it is written to only one display segment (this reads on low or half resolution) and further in addition it is obvious that the secondary controller of

Watabe et al. would provide more information than the emergency backup first controller used when there is a failure of the more complex secondary controller because it would be logical and cost effective to provide only the minimum level of information until the more complex secondary controller is fixed or replaced ).

With regard to claim 2 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 1, further comprising an abnormality detection section for detecting the abnormal condition of the second display control section; wherein the signal switching section outputs the first display signal from the first display control section onto the display section when the abnormality detection section detects the abnormal condition of the second display control section (SEE Watabe et al. column 2, lines 1-10).

With regard to claims 3 and 4 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 2, wherein the first and second display control section comprises the abnormality detection section (SEE Watabe et al. column 2, lines 1-10 and abstract ).

With regard to claim 5 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 1, wherein the operation program in the second display control section is rewrite able (SEE Watabe et al. figure 1, item 6160 "memory unit" and item 6100 "processing unit" and Nakadozono shows in figure 2 a microcomputer and flow charts for programs therefore it is obvious that the memory used is rewrite able so one would have the benefit of being able to reprogram it as hardware changes on the vehicle platform).

With regard to claim 6 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 1, wherein, the first and second display signals comprises image data regarding a same condition. (In the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. the Watabe et al. controllers shift the data to another controller when it fails and therefor the conditions reporting on would be the same only how its being displayed may change).

With regard to claim 7 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 6, wherein the first display signal outputted from the first display control section is lower in display resolution than the second display signal outputted from the second display control section (This limitation was addressed above in claim 12).

With regard to claim 8 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 6, wherein the first display signal outputted from the first display control section is fewer in data amount than the second display signal outputted from the second display control section; and each segment of an image expressed by the first display signal outputted from the first display control section is bigger than that of an image expressed by the second display signal outputted from the second display control section (This limitation was addressed above in claim 12).

With regard to claim 9 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 5, wherein the operation program is read

Art Unit: 2675

from an outer unit, and stored in the second display control section (SEE Watabe et al. column 4, lines 46-65).

With regard to claim 10 The combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest the display control device according to claim 9, wherein the outer unit is a memory card (It is obvious that a outer unit used for programming has a memory).

With regard to claim 11 the combination of Nakadozono and Watabe et al. suggest teaches the display control device according to claim 9, wherein the outer unit is a server from which the operation program is read through a network (It is obvious that a outer unit can be a "server" because it services the PROM by a network which is the electrical connection).

### Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Bell whose telephone number is (703) 306-3019.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377 can help with any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or Faxed to: (703) 872-9306

Or Hand-delivered to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

*Paul Bell*  
Paul Bell  
Art unit 2675  
May 6, 2004

*Chanh Nguyen*  
CHANH NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER